

SAN DIEGO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Friday, April 16, 2010

**General Plan Update; Planning Commission recommendation on Draft Text,
Land Use Maps, Road Network, Community Plans, Implementation Plan and
Conservation Subdivision Program**

Continued from the meeting of March 12, 2010

DRAFT SUMMARY OF MEETING

- A. **Roll Call:** All commissioners present.
- B. **Minutes:**
- C. **Discussion Topics:**

Perkins Property (SD5)

This property is designated on the Referral map as SR-4; staff and the PC tentative recommendation is RL-20. Commissioner Woods motioned to designate this property SR-2. Commissioner Pallinger seconded. The motion carries 6-1 with Commissioner Beck in opposition.

Driesen Property (Twin Oaks)

Commissioner Pallinger motioned to designate this property SR-4. Commissioner Day seconded the motion. The motion fails 5-2. Commission, with no further action, supports the PC tentative recommendation of SR-10.

Leatherbury Property (Fallbrook)

Property owner expressed concerns about the slope restrictions that would occur on his property with a designation of SR-2 on slopes greater than 50%. Property owner wants a

portion of his land designated SR-1 to avoid restrictions on slopes greater than 50% that come with the General Plan Update. Commissioner Beck stated that unless there's a motion and a second, the PC tentative recommendations will remain in effect. There was no motion.

Yasaguchi Property (Twin Oaks)

There was discussion on this property, with no action taken. Therefore the previous PC tentative recommendation stands.

Oliver Property (Pine Valley)

The property owner requested to transfer densities between the two properties. Commissioner Day motioned to take RL-20 to SR-10. Commissioner Pallinger seconded the motion. The motion fails 5-2 with Commissioners Day and Pallinger voting yes. The Commission took no further action, and retained the PC tentative recommendation.

Read Property (North County Metro)

The property owner requested SR-1 for all her and her neighboring properties. The PC took no action.

Herzog Property (Dulzura)

The property owner requested a Rural Commercial designation of all of his property, rather than only the property north of SR-94. The PC did not make a motion, therefore the PC tentative recommendation stands.

BO3

The PC previously recommended SR-10 for this property on November 20, 2009 and took no further action.

Lake Wohlford

The property owner requested SR-0.5; and the staff recommendation to recognize the use is SR-2. The PC took no motion at that time; therefore the PC did take the staff recommendation during their final recommendation.

Eco Village (Bonsall Commercial Center)

The property owner requested an expanded Commercial designation in this area. Staff recommended Neighborhood Commercial to reflect existing uses in the area. The Planning Commission supports staff recommendation and took no motion at that time.

Campus Park West

Staff recommended that the applicant continue to process their pipelined General Plan Amendment (GPA) as they have been and do their own environmental analysis. The PC supported staff's recommendation and took no motion at that time.

Valley Center – Four changes requested by Community Planning Group (CPG)

The CPG recommended four revisions to the PC tentative recommendation for the land use map for Valley Center:

- Item A – Change the area north of Fruitvale Road and east of Cole Grade Road from VR-2.9 to VR-2;
- Item B – Change the area northeast of the North Village from SR-1 to SR-2;
- Item C – Change a two-acre area in the North Village from VR-4.3 to Office Professional; and
- Item D – change an area west of the South Village from SR-1 to SR-10.
- Commissioner Day motioned to approve the CPG recommendation for Items A and C. Commissioner Riess seconded the motion. The motion carried 7-0. Without additional information from property owners there was no action taken on B and D.

Commercial and Industrial Lands (Tecate)

Staff proposed retaining Commercial / Industrial designations comparable to the current General Plan for this the community within the Special Study Area (SSA) and to designate lands outside the SSA as RL-40 in order to contain future development to the Village. Staff discussed special language in the Tecate Community Plan calling for a Special Study and a cap of the average daily traffic that any revisions to the plan would generate so that SR-94 would not need to be widened to four lanes. No motion was taken on this topic.

San Pasqual Valley Road (NC9)

The previous Planning Commission recommendation for this area was to designate three acres Rural Commercial and designate the remainder as SR-2. Further action was continued until this hearing.

Commissioner Day motioned that the entire parcel be designated Semi-Rural 2 (No Commercial). Commissioner Reiss seconded the motion – the motion failed 4-3 with Commissioners Beck, Pallinger and Reiss voting yes.

Commissioner Norby Motioned that only two acres of the property be designated Rural Commercial. Commissioner Reiss seconded the motion, the motion failed 5-2 with Commissioners Norby and Reiss voting yes.

The Planning Commission through no further action retained with their previous action for three acres of Rural Commercial.

Merriam Mountains

The PC tentative recommendation is RL-40. Mr. Russ requested that the Office Professional to be buffered with new Village Residential land use designations. The PC took no action; therefore, the previous recommendations on this property stand.

Public Testimony Closure

Commissioner Pallinger motioned to close public testimony so that the same issues don't keep coming up. Commissioner Brooks seconded the motion. The motion carries 7-0.

Other Issues

Commissioner Beck pointed out issues with Draft Mobility Element Policy: M-12.9 (page 1-44 of the PC Report) and recommended that "wildlife linkages and corridors" be inserted into the policy language. Commissioner Beck motioned to accept insertion. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Day. The motion carried 6-0-1 with Commissioner Reiss absent.

Minimum Lot Size for Valley Center: Commissioner Beck thinks the minimum lot sizes for Valley Center are dramatically different from the other communities. Staff took the lot

size targets and inserted them into the Plan pending the update of the Valley Center Community Plan, which is progressing on a separate track from the General Plan Update. Mr. Rudolph from the Planning Group stated they still need to define specific subareas and their nature.

Conservation Subdivision:

The PC discussed the possibility of including a reference to community-specific design guidelines on the same level of Rural Design Guidelines as referenced in the background to Draft Land Use Element Policy LU 6-3. It was clarified that the implementation plan includes a reference to develop and use the Community-Specific Design Guidelines. No specific motion was made on this item.

Equity Mechanism

Commissioner Beck requested that staff take the criteria that the subcommittee developed and make it into an implementation. Further, before it goes to the Board of Supervisors, he requested that it come back to the PC for an open hearing. Commissioner Woods motioned to accept this action. Commissioner Brooks seconded the motion. The motion carried 6-1 with Commissioner Riess in opposition.

Road 3 (Valley Center)

Board of Supervisors Minute Order #23 directed staff to remove the Road 3A Specific Plan from the General Plan Update but retain the road for analysis purposes. No action was taken and the road remains in the General Plan Update as part of the Referral Map road network.

Groundwater Dependent Areas

The Planning Commission discussed the “discourage” versus “prohibit” language regarding the Borrego aquifer. No action was taken.

Final General Plan Motion

Department of Planning and Land Use Recommendation; That the Planning Commission:

1. Find that they have reviewed and considered the information contained in the draft Environmental Impact Report dated July 1, 2009, and associated documentation on file with the Department of Planning and Land Use as Environmental Review Number 02-ZA-001 prior to making its recommendation on the project.
2. Adopt the Resolution (Attachment B) recommending Board of Supervisor approach of the County of San Diego-initiated comprehensive update of the General Plan, with revisions identified in Attachments C through F, of:
 - a. New Land Use, Mobility, Housing, Conservation and Open Space, Safety and Noise Elements replacing the current Land Use, Circulation, Public Facilities, Housing, Noise, Public Safety, Seismic Safety, Conservation, Open Space, Recreation, Scenic Highway and Energy Elements;
 - b. Amendments to the Land Use Map;
 - c. Amendments to the Circulation Element (renamed Mobility Element) Map;
 - d. Comprehensive updates of the Bonsall, Borrego Springs, Boulevard, Crest/Dehesa, Elfin Forest/Harmony Grove, Fallbrook, Pine Valley, Potrero, Rainbow, Ramona, Spring Valley, and Valle de Oro Community Plans; and
 - e. Amendments to the Alpine, Central Mountain, Desert, Jamul/Dulzura, Julian, Lakeside, Mountain Empire, North County Metro, North Mountain, Otay, Pala/Pauma, San Dieguito, Sweetwater, and Valley Center Community and Subregional Plans.
3. Recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt the General Plan Update Implementation Plan released July 1, 2009 as revised according to Attachment G of this report.
4. Recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Form of Ordinance (Attachment I) implementing the Conservation Subdivision Program.

“AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY CODE TO AMEND TITLE 6, DIVISION 7; TITLE 8, DIVISION 1 AND DIVISION 6; AND AMENDING THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE RELATING TO CONSERVATION SUBDIVISIONS”

Commissioner Woods motioned to adopt staff recommendations as reflected in the staff report to the PC with the exceptions of specific items discussed today. In addition, a TDR program should be developed into an ordinance that will come back to PC before it goes to the Board of Supervisors. Commissioner Norby seconded the motion. The motion carried 6-1 with Commissioner Day in opposition.